

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

MICHAEL J DANIELS, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

AETC II PRIVATIZED HOUSING, LLC,
ET AL.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

5-19-CV-01280-FB-RBF


ORDER

Before the Court is the opposed motion of Defendants to compel a third party Adaptive Environmental Consulting of Texas, Inc. (“Adaptive”) to comply with a duly served subpoena duces tecum (“Subpoena”), which requests the production of certain documents. *See* Dkt. No. 136. The Court finds that the motion, *see* Dkt. No. 136, is well-taken and should be, and hereby is, **GRANTED** as set forth herein.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Adaptive shall further respond to the Subpoena, no later than **TEN DAYS** from the date of entry of this Order, by doing the following: (1) producing any responsive communications and documents not previously produced and that are not protected by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(4)(C); (2) denoting the requests in the Subpoena for which there are no responsive documents by writing “none”; and (3) providing written answers to interrogatory-type requests for which the information is easily accessible. Any documents withheld on the basis of protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(4)(C) shall be separately identified and described in a privilege log such that any claim for protection may be tested by Defendants. Lack of compliance with this Order may subject Adaptive to contempt.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this 7th day of December, 2021.


RICHARD B. FARRER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE